

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: OMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Dext 150 Alexandria Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/693,555	10/20/2000	Kenneth Kornman	MSA-009.01(20974-901)	MSA-009.01(20974-901) 7773	
25181	7590 07/24/2003				
FOLEY HOAG, LLP PATENT GROUP, WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST 155 SEAPORT BLVD			EXAMINER		
			MYERS, CARLA J		
BOSTON, MA 02110			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1634		
			DATE MAILED: 07/24/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Anglicant(a)				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/693,555	KORNMAN ET AL.				
	Examiner Corlo Myore	Art Unit				
The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appe	Carla Myers					
		•				
THE REPLY FILED 23 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica ) a timely filed amendment which	ition. A proper reply to a				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.7	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply of the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 23 June 2003. Appear 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	, ,					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		idered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	· · · —					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3,4,6,7 and 85</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. $\square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on $\_\_\_$ is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·				
10.☐ Other: CARLA J. M PRIMARY EX						

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the objection over the amendment filed October 4, 2002 and the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claims stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-double patenting. In the response of June 23, 2003, Applicants state that a terminal disclaimer will be filed once the claims are otherwise allowable.